

09/834,084

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above referenced application in view of the enclosed amendments and remarks is requested.

The requested changes to the Abstract have been made per the Examiner's recommendations. A replacement Abstract is included herein.

Since the Examiner has cited and provided the same SDMI specification in the IDS attached to the present Office action, the Applicants do not see how further citing and submission of this SDMI specification in a new IDS is necessary.

The browser-executable hyperlinks in the paragraphs of the Specification starting at page 3, line 25, and at page 6, line 23, have been changed as requested and a replacement paragraph is included herein.

Claims 1, 10, 19, and 25 have been amended to overcome the grammatical objections listed in the Office action.

Claims 8, 1-18, and 25-28 are rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicants regard as the invention. The noted instances of insufficient antecedent basis have been fixed in claims 8, 10, 11, 12, 17, 18, 25, and 28. This rejection is now moot and must be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 8, 10-12, 17-19, 25 and 28 have been amended. Claims 2, 6, 11, 15, and 21 have been canceled. Claims 1, 3-5, 7-10, 12-14, 16-20, and 22-28 remain in the application.

ARGUMENT

Claims 1 and 10 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fox (US 5,765,172) in view of RFC 2104.

09/834,084

Independent claims 1 and 11 have been amended to include the limitations of dependent claims 2 and 11, respectively.

The Examiner asserts at page 7, lines 8-11 of the Office action dated January 13, 2005, that Stefik at col. 3, lines 34-50 teaches presenting a challenge code to a user of the application program, requiring the user to obtain a passcode in response to the challenge code, and determining validity of the passcode, and performing the recalculating and copying only when the passcode is valid. This assertion is incorrect and without foundation. Upon close inspection of the cited text of Stefik, as well as the rest of Stefik, it is clear that Stefik does not teach or suggest this limitation. The cited text refers to US patent 5,247,575 to Sprague, and discloses that a central accounting facility issues keys to decrypt information packages. This, however, does not teach or suggest presenting a challenge code to a user of the application program, requiring the user to obtain a passcode in response to the challenge code, and determining validity of the passcode, and performing the recalculating and copying only when the passcode is valid as recited in amended claim 1. Furthermore, the limitation is not taught or suggested anywhere in Stefik, Fox, or RFC 2104. If at least one limitation of a claim is not taught or suggested by the cited art, then the claim is not rendered obvious. Therefore, amended claims 1 and 10 are allowable as presented.

Claims 2-5 and 11-14 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fox (US 5,765,172) in view of Stefik (US 5,715,403) and RFC 2104.

Claims 2 and 11 have been incorporated into claims 1 and 10, respectively. As argued above, claims 1 and 10 are now allowable. Accordingly, all claims dependent therefrom are also allowable. Hence, claims 3-5 and 12-14 are also allowable.

Claims 6 and 15 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fox in view of Stefik, "SDMI Portable Device Specification, part 1, Version 1.0" (hereinafter SDMI), and RFC 2104.

Claims 6 and 15 have been cancelled, so this rejection is now moot.

09/834,084

Claims 7-9, 16-20 and 22-28 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fox in view of Stefik and RFC 2104.

As to claims 7-9 and 16-18, these claims depend from allowable claims 1 and 10, respectively. Therefore, they are also allowable.

As to independent claims 19 and 25, these claims are allowable based on the same reasoning as amended claims 1 and 11. That is, the cited art does not teach or suggest presenting a challenge code to a user of the application program, requiring the user to obtain a passcode in response to the challenge code, and determining validity of the passcode, and recalculating the second MAC using a portion of the first MAC and copying the second control database over the first control database only when the passcode is valid. This, claims 19 and 25 are allowable, and all claims dependent therefrom are also allowable (i.e., claims 20, 22-24, and 26-28).

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fox in view of Stefik, SDMI, and RFC 2104.

Claims 21 has been cancelled, so this rejection is now moot.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Claims 1, 3-5, 7-10, 12-14, 16-20, and 22-28 are all in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (503) 264-8074. Early issuance of Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

s/Steven P. Skabrat/
Senior Attorney
Intel Corporation
Registration No. 36,279
(503) 264-8074

09/334,084

c/o Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor &
Zafman, LLP
12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

*I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted
to the United States Patent and Trademark Office at:*

1-703-872-9306
Facsimile Number
QOH:O 3-3-05
Signature Date